

2                   MR. FREHNER:    My name is Dan Frehner and I'm the  
3    NOV 09 1999    chairman for Lincoln County Commission.  I'm also vice-chairman  
4    of the Lincoln County/City of Caliente Impact Alleviation  
5    Committee.

6                   I've come this evening to provide preliminary  
7    reaction to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the DEIS  
8    for the Yucca Mountain Project.

9                   My initial comments tonight will be supplemented  
10   by formal written comments to the DEIS to be submitted by  
11   Lincoln County and the City of Caliente.

12                   My statement this evening is a supplement to  
13   remarks offered this afternoon by Mayor Kevin Phillips of the  
14   City of Caliente.

15                   I wish that Mr. Phillips' testimony this  
16   afternoon be incorporated by reference and make it part of my  
17   statement.

18                   As I begin, I wish to convey my gratitude to the  
19   Department of Energy for deciding to hold hearings on the Yucca  
20   Mountain DEIS in Lincoln County.

21                   Since the early 1980s, DOE has considered Lincoln  
22   County and the City of Caliente as candidate for a truck and/or  
23   rail shipments of spent nuclear fuel and other high-level  
24   radioactive waste destined for Yucca Mountain.

25                   Beginning in 1984, the Lincoln County Commission  
1   and the Caliente City Council have, through their Joint City/  
2   County Impact Alleviation Committee, sought to keep area  
3   residents fully informed about DOE proposals for management of  
4   radioactive waste potentially impacting on the County and City.

5                   I am convinced that among all affected units of  
6   local government and the State of Nevada, Lincoln County and

7 City of Caliente have maintained the greatest degree of public  
8 involvement in repository oversight activities.

9 As a consequence of local public information and  
10 involvement initiatives, County and City residents have become  
11 well informed and are interested in the implications, both  
12 negative and positive, of radioactive waste management  
13 activities in Nevada.

14 Such interest has been borne out by the excellent  
15 degree of resident participation at this and other meetings  
16 held in the County regarding radioactive waste management  
17 issues.

1 18 As my comments will reveal, [Lincoln County and  
19 the City of Caliente are concerned that DOE has and may  
20 continue in the future to largely ignore the legitimate  
21 concerns of the County, the City and the residents.]

22 Let me also thank staff and Nuclear Regulatory  
23 Commission who are in attendance this evening. Your  
24 willingness to return to Lincoln County to learn of local  
25 concerns and to gain local insights into the NEPA related  
1 subjects is a credit to the degree to which residents of  
2 Lincoln County and the City of Caliente are informed about  
3 nuclear waste management issues.

2 4 [I believe that the prospectives of local  
5 residents can serve to improve federal decisions. I trust that  
6 the NRC will work with the DOE to prepare a Final EIS which is  
7 responsive to the verbal and written comments from Lincoln  
8 County and the City of Caliente.]

9 As Mayor Phillips noted this afternoon, it's  
10 important to know that our comments today are not another  
11 uninformed "not-in-my-backyard" reaction on the Draft Yucca  
12 Mountain EIS.

13                   To the contrary, my remarks reflect a recognition  
14 that our nation faces a serious environmental problem and  
15 desire of Lincoln County and the City of Caliente to ensure  
16 that if it is the will of the Congress to dispose of spent  
17 nuclear fuel and other high-level nuclear fuel in Nevada, that  
18 the resulting waste management system be developed and operated  
19 in a manner which minimizes risk and maximizes local economic  
20 and fiscal benefits.

21                   The ability of the County and City to provide DOE  
22 with quality input is based upon the lengthy involvement of  
23 concerned citizens, independent local research and prior  
24 experience with DOE NEPA compliance activities.

25                   For the past fifteen years, Lincoln County and  
1 the City of Caliente have conducted a joint repository  
2 oversight and impact alleviation planning program.

3                   Through a memorandum of understanding, the County  
4 and City have established a Joint City/County Alleviation  
5 Committee to oversee repository oversight and -- and the impact  
6 assessment activities.

7                   During this period, the eight-member JCCCIAC has  
8 diligently sought to provide guidance to local repository  
9 programs.

10                   The Committee, representing both geographic and  
11 disciplinary diversity, have met no less than eighty times and  
12 has invested over 1,500 hours of largely volunteer time to  
13 understand the implications of the nuclear waste management  
14 program to the residents, visitors and to institutions in  
15 Lincoln County and the City of Caliente.

16                   Recently the Lincoln County and City of Caliente  
17 Joint Impact Alleviation Committee has reaffirmed the goals of

18 the County/City repository oversight program. Three goals  
19 which drive County and City oversight initiatives include, one,  
20 to understand and minimize risk; two, to understand and  
21 minimize impacts; and number three, to understand and maximize  
22 potential benefits associated with Department of Energy  
23 radioactive waste management activities in Nevada.

24 For the past several years, the majority of  
25 County residents have demonstrated their concurrence with the  
1 direction of Lincoln County and the City of Caliente are taking  
2 with regard to risk minimization, impact minimization and  
3 benefit maximization.

4 It is obvious to me that the public information  
5 implemented by the County and City have resulted in a public  
6 which is informed about DOE plans and potential positive and  
7 negative consequences of radioactive waste management in  
8 Nevada.

9 Utilizing funding provided by the DOE, the Joint  
10 City/County Impact Alleviation Committee has overseen the  
11 preparation of over fifty reports documenting repository  
12 implications for Lincoln County and the City of Caliente.

13 Topics addressed within these studies include  
14 emergency response, ethnography, transfer station routing,  
15 economic/demographic impact assessment, media amplification of  
16 risk, community development, transportation risk, assessment  
17 risk, communication, tourism impact assessment, fiscal impact  
18 assessment and risk perception, among others.

19 The numerous studies sponsored by the County and  
20 City of Caliente were conducted by teams of highly trained and  
21 competent researchers representing both academic and private  
22 entities.

23 In addition, State of Nevada Nuclear Waste

24 Projects Office has conducted numerous studies which directly  
25 or indirectly address repository implications with Lincoln  
1 County and the City of Caliente.

2 Copies of the biblio -- bibliography of County  
3 and City responsive research are available on the display  
4 table.

5 MR. LAWSON: Mr. Frehner, take your time.  
6 You're going to have the chance to read the whole thing, so  
7 relax a little bit. Take a breath. You're going too fast for  
8 the court reporter.

9 MR. FREHNER: The extensive information base  
10 represented by these various studies was used by Lincoln County  
11 and the City of Caliente to develop a comprehensive DEIS  
12 scoping reports which were provided to the Department of Energy  
13 in December of 1995.

14 In response to requests from DOE for reference  
15 documents, Lincoln County and the City of Caliente also  
16 provided DOE and DOE contractor staff with a briefing on the  
17 numerous studies sponsored by the Joint City/County Impact  
18 Alleviation Committee.

19 Diskettes containing database and economic  
20 demographic models were also provided to DOE and DOE contractor  
21 staff. Copies of County/City DEIS scoping report are available  
22 on the display table.

3 23 Like Mayor Phillips, I'm very concerned that  
24 despite extensive efforts by County and City staff to respond  
25 to DOE requests for information, little, if any, of the  
1 information has found its way into the -- the DEIS.

2 I find that not one of the many documents  
3 provided by the County and City are even referenced in DEIS.

4 Absent such references, I must conclude that DOE

3 cont'd.

5 did not utilize information provided to it. I find this to be  
6 a serious deficiency in the DEIS.

7 DOE has elected to largely ignore most if not all  
8 of the issues raised by Lincoln County and the City of Caliente  
9 during the scoping or the DEIS.

10 DOE has failed to base little, if any, of the  
11 descriptions of the existing conditions and evaluations of  
12 impacts upon the extensive base of information provided by  
13 Lincoln County and the City of Caliente.

14 As a consequence, the Yucca Mountain DEIS largely  
15 is non-responsive to the issues of most concern to the County  
16 and City. ]

17 Examples of issues raised by the City and County  
18 during the scoping were not addressed adequately or at all in  
19 the DEIS include, number one, [page 25, the County/City EIS  
20 scoping report notes that Lincoln County and the City of  
21 Caliente have prepared pre -- periodic assessments of local  
22 emergency response capabilities, and such capabilities have  
23 been found to be in -- insufficient to adequately respond to  
24 accidents involving spent nuclear fuel. ]

17

18 Number two, [page 28 of the County/City EIS  
19 scoping report points out the need for the DEIS to consider  
20 unavoidable impacts which can not be mitigated.

18

21 Additional transportation risk and compensation  
22 for such impacts must be considered. ]

19 And number three, [page 32 of the County/City DEIS  
20 scoping report presented evidence that a transportation  
21 accident characterized by extensive media reporting might  
22 result in stigmatization towards destinations in Lincoln  
23 County, including five State Parks.

19 cont'd. 10 A loss of tourism during peak season could pose  
11 significant economic and fiscal consequences in Lincoln County.  
12 Mitigation of such a potential impact might include a  
13 contingent tourism marketing plan which is ready to -- ready to  
14 implement the instant an accident occurs.]

20 [If the DOE renders any decision based upon the  
15 conduct within the DEIS, such decisions will be made without  
16 sufficient knowledge of the consequences of such actions upon  
17 residents, visitors, institutions and environment of Lincoln  
18 County and the City of Caliente.

20 The DOE's failure to consider issues of concern  
21 to Lincoln County and the City of Caliente will preclude  
22 effective minimization of risk, minimization of impacts and  
23 maximization of benefits.

24 DOE is encouraged to prepare a Final EIS which  
25 addresses concerns raised in scoping by Lincoln County and City  
1 of Caliente which presents viable proposals for mitigation and  
2 compensation of impacts.]

4 3 I feel it's important to -- to restate a concern  
4 raised by Mayor Phillips this afternoon. [The DEIS describes  
5 the objections of the United States Air Force to the use of the  
6 Chalk Mountain route.

7 Based upon these objections, the DEIS has  
8 characterized the Chalk Mountain route as the non-preferred  
9 alternative, the only transportation corridor alternative to be  
10 so labeled.

11 The objections of elected leaders of Clark  
12 Coun -- Clark County and its municipalities on the shipments of  
13 radioactive waste through the Las Vegas valley have been  
14 repeated and well publicized.

4 cont'd.

15 Why given these steadfast objections didn't the  
 16 DEIS consider transportation alternatives through Clark County  
 17 to be non-preferred?

5

18 Insufficient justification for labeling the Chalk  
 19 Mountain route as non-preferred exists within the DEIS. [If the  
 20 Chalk Mountain route serves to minimize risk of transporting  
 21 radioactive wastes through Nevada, then it should be considered  
 22 a preferred alternative and every effort made in the FEIS to  
 23 identify options to mitigation concerns of the Air Force.

24 For example -- excuse me -- if the Air Force is  
 25 concerned about breaches in security, then DOE should require  
 1 that all truck drivers and escorts and rail crew members have  
 2 necessary security clearance.

3 Given the nature of the materials to be  
 4 transported across the Nellis range, it does not appear overly  
 5 difficult to mitigate concern of the Air Force.

6 Rather than mention the potential Chalk Mountain  
 7 route, the Final EIS should be -- seek to find ways as workable  
 8 as possible. The Final EIS must provide a better justification  
 9 for the use of -- of non-preferred label on all routes  
 10 considered.]

11 Lincoln County and the City of Caliente  
 12 reviewed -- Caliente's review of the DEIS was focused in part  
 13 upon the extent to which the documents provides sufficient  
 14 information to assist with accomplishment of the aforementioned  
 15 goals of the Joint City/County repository oversight program.

6

16 [Our prel -- preliminary review of the documents  
 17 suggest that adequate detail are not available to understand  
 18 the nature and magnitude of the repository system risks, to  
 19 understand the nature and extent of environmental, socioecon --

6 cont'd. 20 socioeconomic and sociocultural, fiscal and fiscal impacts and  
21 to understand the types, characteristics and implementation or  
22 benefits.]

23 With regard to benefits, let me close by  
24 observing that is presented within the DEIS, the greatest  
25 source of death resulting from management of spent nuc --  
1 nuclear fuel and other high-level radioactive waste will not be  
2 migration of radioisotopes to the accessible environment.

21 3 [Information contained within table 2-7 of the  
4 DEIS reveals that the largest source of fatalities will be  
5 highway accidents resulting from transportation of radioactive  
6 waste.

7 Table 2-7 of the DEIS suggests that protection of  
8 public health and safety is the primary goal of the nation's  
9 radioactive waste management program, then on-site storage  
10 within a hundred years will minimize fatalities.]

7 11 [Lincoln County and the City of Caliente  
12 recognize, however, that many compelling reasons exist to move  
13 waste to a central repository, not the least of which may be to  
14 achieve long-term health or safety benefits.

15 The fact remains that if waste is brought to  
16 Nevada, risk will be minimized or eliminated as existing  
17 storage sites and concentrated in south-central Nevada.

18 Table 2-7 or the DEIS indicates that during the  
19 placement phase of the repository, risk will be the highest  
20 among the transportation corridors used to bring waste to Yucca  
21 Mountain.

22 Lincoln County and the City of Caliente see the  
23 shifting of risks from current storage sites to Nevada as a  
24 question of equity, one that is not addressed at all within the

7 cont'd.

25 DEIS.

1                   At a minimum, the Final EIS should provide  
2 enhancement of the cause and risk benefits which will accrue  
3 to the nation by moving waste to Nevada.]

8

4                   [The Final EIS should evaluate the fes --  
5 feasibility of compensating Nevadans for the new risks that  
6 they will incur.]

1  
25

MAYOR PHILLIPS: My name is Kevin Phillips and I

ATLAS REPORTING SERVICES  
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA  
(888) 4-ATLAS-1

~~6~~

1 am mayor of the City of Caliente. I am also chairman of the  
2 Lincoln County/City of Caliente Joint City/County Impact  
3 Alleviation Committee.

4 I'm here today to offer initial comments on the  
5 sufficiency of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, DEIS  
6 for the Yucca Mountain Project to support waste management  
7 program decisions.

8 My preliminary observations today will be  
9 supplemented by formal written comments to the DEIS to be  
10 submitted by Lincoln County and the City of Caliente.

11 The remarks which follow are intended to  
12 supplement comments to be offered by Chairman Dan Frehner of  
13 the Lincoln County Commission this evening.

14 My testimony this afternoon incorporates by  
15 reference this evening's comments by Chairman Frehner.

16 On the outset, let me express my appreciation to  
17 the Department of Energy for electing to hold hearings on the  
18 Yucca Mountain DEIS in Caliente. We're sincerely grateful.

19 Since the early 1980s, DOE has considered Lincoln  
20 County and the City of Caliente as a candidate corridor for  
21 truck and/or rail shipments of spent nuclear fuel and other  
22 high-level radioactive waste destined for Yucca Mountain.

23 Beginning in 1984, the Lincoln County Commission  
24 and the Caliente City Council have, through their Joint City/  
25 County Impact Alleviation Committee, sought to keep area

ATLAS REPORTING SERVICES  
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA  
(888) 4-ATLAS-1

X

12

1 residents fully informed about DOE proposals for management of  
2 radioactive waste potentially impacting upon the County and the  
3 City.

4 As a consequence of local public information  
5 initiatives, County and City residents have become well  
6 informed and are interested in the implications, both negative  
7 and positive, of radioactive waste management activities in  
8 Nevada.

9 Such interest has been borne out by the excellent  
10 degree of resident participation at this and other meetings  
11 held in the County regarding radioactive waste management  
12 issues.

22

13 As my comments will reveal, [Lincoln County and  
14 the City of Caliente are concerned that DOE has and may  
15 continue in the future to largely ignore the legitimate  
16 concerns of the County, the City and the residents.]

17 It is important to note that my comments today  
18 are not another uninformed not-in-my-backyard reaction to the  
19 draft Yucca Mountain EIS.

20 To the contrary, my remarks reflect well informed  
21 and carefully considered reactions to DOE's evaluation to the  
22 possible impacts of building, operating and closing the  
23 proposed nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain.

24 The ability of the County and the City to provide  
25 DOE to with quality input is based upon the lengthy involvement

4

13

1 of concerned citizens, independent local research and prior  
2 experience with DOE/NEPA compliance activities.

3                   For the pass fifteen years, Lincoln County and  
4 the City of Caliente conducted a Joint Repository Oversight and  
5 Impact Alleviation Planning Program. Through a memorandum of  
6 understanding, the County and the City have established the  
7 Joint City/County Impact Alleviation Committee, JCCIAC to  
8 oversee repository oversight and independent impact assessment  
9 activities.

10                   During this period, the eight-member JCCIAC  
11 committee has diligently sought to provide guidance to local  
12 repository programs.

13                   The committee representing both geographic and  
14 disciplinary diversity has met no less than eighty times and  
15 has invested over 1,500 hours of largely volunteer time to  
16 understand the implications of the nation's nuclear waste  
17 management program to the residents of and visitors to and the  
18 institutions within Lincoln County and the City of Caliente.

19                   Recently the Lincoln County and City of Caliente  
20 Joint Impact Alleviation Committee reaffirmed the goals of the  
21 County/City repository oversight program.

22                   The three goals which drive the County and City  
23 oversight initiatives include, first, to understand and  
24 minimize risks; secondly, to understand and minimize impacts;  
25 and thirdly, to understand and maximize potential benefits

1 associated with the Department of Energy radioactive waste  
2 management activities in Nevada.

3 Over the past several years, a majority of County  
4 residents have demonstrated their concurrence with the  
5 direction of Lincoln County and the City of Caliente are taking  
6 with regard to risk minimization -- excuse me. Risk  
7 minimization, impact minimization and benefit maximization.

8 MR. LAWSON: I have thirty seconds left of five  
9 minutes.

10 Would you like a few more minutes to finish up?

11 MAYOR PHILLIPS: If I may conclude my remarks, I  
12 would appreciate that. If you would choose to have me end and  
13 come back another time.

14 MR. LAWSON: Does anybody have a problem if I  
15 let him finish his comments? I don't want to set a bad  
16 precedent here, but you're mayor and I would like to have you  
17 have a chance to finish.

18 MAYOR PHILLIPS: It would be nice if all were so  
19 considerate.

20 May I continue?

21 MR. LAWSON: I'm not a voter in this town.  
22 Please.

23 MAYOR PHILLIPS: Thank you. Thank you, folks.

24 Over the past several years -- excuse me. A  
25 majority of County residents have -- have demonstrated

1 concurrence with the direction the elected officials are taking  
2 with regard to risk minimization impact, minimization and  
3 benefit maximization.

4                   It is obvious to me that public information  
5 initiatives implemented by the County and City resulted in a  
6 public which is informed about DOE plans and potential positive  
7 and negative consequences of radioactive waste management in  
8 Nevada.

9                   Utilizing funding provided by the Department of  
10 Energy, the committee has overseen the preparation of nearly  
11 fifty reports documenting the repository system implications  
12 for Lincoln County and the City of Caliente.

13                   Topics addressed within these studies include  
14 emergency response, ethnography, transportation routing,  
15 economic and impact assessment, media amplification of risks,  
16 community development, transportation risk assessment, risk  
17 communication, tourism impact assessment, fiscal impact  
18 assessment and risk perception, among others.

19                   The numerous studies sponsored by the County and  
20 the City were conducted by teams of highly trained and  
21 competent researchers representing both academic and private  
22 entities.

23                   In addition, the State of Nevada's Nuclear Waste  
24 Project Office has conducted numerous studies which directly or  
25 indirectly addressed repository implications within Lincoln

**EIS000676**

1 County and the City of Caliente.

2 Copies of the bibliography of County and City  
3 sponsored research are available on the display table.

4 Extensive information phase represented by these  
5 various studies was used by Lincoln County and the City of  
6 Caliente to develop a comprehensive DEIS scoping report which  
7 was provided to the Department of Energy in December of '95.

8 In response to a request from DOE or reference  
9 documents, the Lincoln County/City of Caliente also provided  
10 DOE and DOE contractor staff with a briefing on the numerous  
11 studies sponsored by the committee.

12 Diskettes containing databases and economic  
13 demographic models were also provided to DOE and DOE contractor  
14 staff.

15 Copies of these scoping reports are available,  
16 also, on the display table.

9

17 Now I am deeply disappointed that despite the  
18 exhaustive efforts by the County and City Staff to respond to  
19 DOE requests for information, little, if any, of the  
20 information has found its way into the DEIS.

21 DOE has elected to largely ignore most, if not  
22 all, of the issues raised by Lincoln County during scoping of  
23 the DEIS.

24 DOE has failed to base little, if any, of its  
25 descriptions of existing conditions and evaluations of impacts

9 cont'd.

1 upon the extensive base of information provided by the County  
2 and the City.

3 As a consequence, the Yucca Mountain DEIS is  
4 largely non-responsive to the issues of most concern to the  
5 County and the City.

10

6 Examples of issues raised by City and County  
7 during scoping are not addressed adequately, if at all, in the  
8 DEIS include first: [Pages 25 and 26 of the County/City EIS  
9 scoping report note that construction and operation of a rail  
10 line may impair access to forage and water by domestic  
11 livestock.

12 The DEIS indicates that rail corridors would  
13 cross grazing allotments, but does not describe the impacts,  
14 construction and use of a rail line would have on domestic  
15 livestock operations in Lincoln County.

11

16 Secondly, [page 29 of the City/County EIS scoping  
17 report point out the need for the DEIS to consider  
18 distributional equity.

19 Nowhere in the DEIS could we find any  
20 consideration of the inequitable distribution of risk and  
21 related impacts which will accrue to south central Nevada.

12

22 Thirdly, [on page 30 of our scoping report, we  
23 provided a range of estimates of the population and demand for  
24 housing, which will be induced by a range of new jobs.

25 While the DEIS estimates the number of jobs which

12 cont'd. 1 might be associated with intermodal activities in Caliente,  
2 rail line construction in the County and operation of heavy  
3 haul trucks across Lincoln County, no estimate of induced  
4 population and related demands for housing, other public  
5 services, namely schools, is provided.

13 6 [Furthermore, if the DOE renders any decisions  
7 based upon the content within the DEIS, such decisions will be  
8 made without sufficient knowledge of the consequences of such  
9 actions upon the residents, visitors, institutions and  
10 environments of Lincoln County and the City of Caliente.

11 The DOE's failure to consider issues of concern  
12 to Lincoln County and the City of Caliente will preclude  
13 effective minimization of risk, maximization of impacts and  
14 max -- excuse me. Minimization of impacts and maximization of  
15 benefits.

16 DOE is encouraged to prepare a Final EIS which  
17 addresses concerns raised in the scoping by Lincoln County and  
18 the City of Caliente which presents viable proposals for  
19 mitigation and compensation of impacts.

20 I would be remiss if my preliminary comments did  
21 not highlight one curious inconsistency Lincoln County and the  
22 City of Caliente have identified within the DEIS.

14 23 [The document describes the objections of the  
24 United States Air Force to use the Chalk Mountain route. Based  
25 upon these objections, the DEIS has characterized the Chalk

14 cont'd.

1 Mountain route as a quote non-preferred alternative, closed  
2 quote, the only transportation corridor alternative to be so  
3 labeled.

4                   The objections of the elected leaders of Clark  
5 County and its municipalities to shipments of radioactive waste  
6 through the Las Vegas Valley have been repeated and well  
7 publicized.

8                   Why given the steadfast objections did the DEIS  
9 not consider transportation alternatives through Clark County  
10 to be non-preferred?

23

11                   Insufficient justification for labeling the Chalk  
12 Mountain route as non-preferred exists within the DEIS.       If the  
13 Chalk Mountain route serves to minimize risks of transporting  
14 radioactive wastes through Nevada, then it should be considered  
15 a preferred alternative and every effort made in the FEIS to  
16 identify options to mitigate concerns of the Air Force.

17                   For example -- and I'm almost finished -- if the  
18 Air Force is concerned about breaches in security, then DOE  
19 could require that all truck drivers and escorts or rail crew  
20 members have necessary security clearances.

21                   Given the nature of the materials to be  
22 transported across the Nellis range, it does not appear overly  
23 difficult to mitigate concerns of the Air Force.

24                   Rather than diminishing the potential of the  
25 Chalk Mountain route, the Final EIS should seek ways to make

16  
20

23 cont'd.

1 the route as workable as possible.

2 Final EIS must provide a better justification for  
3 the use or failure to use non-preferred label on routes  
4 considered.

5 Lincoln County and the City of Caliente's review  
6 of the DEIS is focused in part upon the extent to which the  
7 document provides sufficient information to assist with the  
8 accomplishment of the aforementioned goals of the Joint City/  
9 County Repository Oversight Program.

15

10 Our preliminary review of the documents suggest  
11 that adequate detail is not available to understand the nature  
12 and magnitude of repository system risk to understand the  
13 nature and extent of environmental, socioeconomic, socio-  
14 cultural, fiscal and physical impacts to understand the types,  
15 characteristics and implementation as well as for benefits.

16 With regard to benefits, let me close by  
17 observing that as presented within the DEIS, the greatest  
18 source of death resulting from management of spent fuel and  
19 other high-level radioactive wastes will not be to the  
20 migration of radio isotopes to the accessible environment.

16

21 Information contained within table 2-7 of the  
22 DEIS reveals that the largest source of fatalities will be  
23 highway accidents resulting from the transportation of  
24 radioactive waste.

25 Table 2-7 of the DEIS suggests that if protection

1 of public health and safety is the primary goal of the nation's  
2 radioactive waste management program, that on-site storage  
3 during the next one hundred years will minimize fatalities ] from  
4 accident by highway.

5 MR. LAWSON: I will have to ask you to conclude.

6 MAYOR PHILLIPS: I'm concluding.

24

7 [Lincoln County and the City of Caliente  
8 recognize, however, that many compelling reasons exist to move  
9 waste to a central repository, not the least of which may be to  
10 achieve long-term health and safety benefits.]

25

11 [The Final EIS should evaluate the feasibility of  
12 compensating Nevada for the new risk they will incur] to  
13 Nevadans, and I thank you very much for your time and  
14 consideration.

15 MS. SWEENEY: Thank you, sir.

ATLAS REPORTING SERVICES  
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA  
(888) 4-ATLAS-1

21  
22